



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11/

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,651	01/24/2002	Tetsuya Tsunekawa	1319-01	7108
35811	7590	05/27/2004	EXAMINER	
IP DEPARTMENT OF PIPER RUDNICK LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE, SUITE 4900 1650 MARKET ST PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			SIMONE, CATHERINE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/980,651	TSUNEKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Catherine Simone	1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejections

1. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 of record in Paper mailed 12/1/03, Pages 2-4, Paragraph #5 has been withdrawn due to the Applicant's response filed 3/17/04.

Repeated Rejections

2. The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 as anticipated by Tsunekawa et al. is repeated for the reasons previously of record in Paper mailed 12/1/03, Pages 5-6, Paragraph #7.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that "the language in column 15 actually does not apply to the film, but instead, applies to the guide pin utilized in the high speed abrasion resistance test." Applicants further argue that "It can be seen that the terms enclosed within the parentheses in both locations of that above sentence refers to the language immediately in front of the parentheses. Thus, the "running speed 250m/min... running tension 90g" is a descriptor of the tape runability tester. Similarly, the surface roughness language within the parentheses is a descriptor of the guide pin. The surface roughness does not apply to the half inch wide tape." However, it is to be pointed out in the Tsunekawa et al. reference that the film is taught to have a surface roughness (see col. 14, lines 29-35) and it is inherently in the range of 10 nm to 140 nm

Art Unit: 1772

and Tsunekawa et al. inherently teaches an elongation at break in a machine direction of 70% to 150%, since the film of Tsunekawa et al. is a biaxially oriented polyester film consisting of the same components, ethylene terephthalate and polyether imide (see col. 3, lines 25-30), and has a glass transition temperature of 105 to 145°C (see col. 35, lines 53-55), which is the same to that of the film being claimed in the present invention. Therefore, Tsunekawa et al. teaches that which is being claimed in the present invention. Thus, the claims fail to patentably define over the Tsunekawa et al. reference.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catherine Simone whose telephone number is (571)272-1501. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1772

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CS
Catherine Simone
Examiner
Art Unit 1772
May 19, 2004

HP
HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772 5/24/04